

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2005.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, April 4, 2005 at 6:02 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Fitch, Ballew, Ralston, Lundberg, Woodrow and Pishioneri. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

1. Lane Transit District (LTD) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Alternatives.

Transportation Manager Nick Arnis presented the staff report on this item. In Fall of 2001, the council recommended that Lane Transit District (LTD) study the Pioneer Parkway corridor for the next bus rapid transit project in Springfield. After two years of study and stakeholder meetings, LTD is ready to initiate the formal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process that evaluates alternatives on the Pioneer Parkway corridor that includes roads in the RiverBend site, International Way, Gateway Street, and Harlow Road.

The last meeting by LTD with council about the Pioneer Parkway EmX project was July 12, 2004. At that time, LTD staff updated council about the EmX concept alternatives and the stakeholder meetings that reviewed and commented on ideas and concepts. City and LTD staffs have reviewed the stakeholder comments and refined EmX alternatives for the Pioneer Parkway corridor for the EIS evaluation process. City staff is currently reviewing an LTD report, Draft Detailed Definition of Alternatives, for fatal flaws before the document is used as a starting point for the EIS process. Possible issues during the EIS process, according to city staff, will be loss of property for right of way, driveway restrictions to some commercial properties, coordination with the Gateway/Beltline intersection project, traffic operations at congested intersections with an EmX project, and regional road network impacts. These issues and others raised by the public will be documented and addressed with possible mitigations during the EIS alternatives evaluation process. When a Draft EIS is completed later in 2006, LTD will be seeking City Council and Lane County Board of Commissioners approval. On April 14, 2005, 4-6pm, LTD will conduct an open house in the Library Meeting Room, for the public to review and comment on the alternatives that will be evaluated in the EIS process.

Mr. Arnis introduced Stefano Viggiano, Project Manager from LTD.

Mr. Viggiano introduced LTD Board Members Mike Eister and Debbie Davis. He also introduced LTD's General Manager Ken Hamm and Project Engineer Graham Carey.

Mr. Viggiano said LTD staff was looking for comments from the council regarding the alternatives LTD would be studying as part of the process. He reminded council that the corridor was selected by the Springfield City Council and the LTD Board. He referred to a map that outlined this corridor and where it would extend. He pointed out the first EmX corridor which connected downtown Eugene and Springfield. This would be an extension from the eastern end of that corridor. He described the new EmX corridor. Federal funds were used for planning and

would be used for construction of this project. Federal funding would require a prescribed set of procedures that must be followed. The EIS was part of the process dictated by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). LTD had worked with a group of stakeholders to come up with viable alternatives. He distributed a document with the detailed definition of the alternatives. LTD was also soliciting input from council and the public on these alternatives. A Methods and Data Report was nearly completed that described how LTD would analyze the project and what data sources would be used. LTD would need concurrence from the partner agencies on that process. He explained the process and project approval by the Springfield City Council, the LTD Board and the Lane County Board of Commissioners. The final design would follow.

Mr. Viggiano said there were four primary alternatives described in the agenda packet: 1) No Build; 2) Transportation Systems Management (TSM); 3) EmX Alternative 1; and 4) EmX Alternative 2. The first alternative was required as an alternative by the Federal process. The second alternative was also required and included low-cost treatments, but would not include exclusive lanes and major stations. The third and fourth alternatives were for building of lanes for the EmX, the second having a greater impact on property. The alternatives could be mixed and matched throughout the corridor. That would be appropriate when looking at the draft Environmental Impact Study. He asked for input from council on the alternatives or other options.

Mr. Viggiano referred to maps that outlined the two build alternatives. He did not bring a design for the No Build and TSM alternatives because they would not change the corridor. He referred to those charts and explained those two alternatives and how each would change the corridor.

Councilor Ballew asked if the bus lane would also be a turn lane.

Mr. Viggiano said that was correct. He explained.

Councilor Lundberg asked where parking would be removed.

Mr. Viggiano pointed out the area that would be affected along the east side of Pioneer Parkway East and Pioneer Parkway West. It would mostly affect downtown on-street parking. Part of the analysis would be to determine how well the parking would be utilized and to solicit comments regarding concerns of the removal of the parking spaces.

Councilor Lundberg said it appeared the choice was to take out parking rather than moving into the railroad right-of-way.

Mr. Viggiano said moving into the railroad right-of-way was not an alternative the stakeholders liked. He said they could consider that option if council chose.

Councilor Lundberg felt the loss of downtown parking would be an issue.

Mr. Viggiano referred to another map showing the grass median between the two parkways. Citizens indicated a preference to leave the bike/pedestrian path where it was currently located. Both alternatives would leave the bike path where it was currently located. He said alternatives were considered that focused the service on the east side due to the bike path and trees. Under Alternative 1, the northbound service would essentially be a third lane, which would require widening of the road. The southbound service would be inside the first row of trees. Under

Alternative 2, both the north and southbound service would be in the median and the roadway would be left alone.

Councilor Ralston asked if two lanes were needed.

Mr. Viggiano said the preference was to have two lanes to avoid delays. In some sections, there were only single lanes. In this area, because they had the available right-of-way, both alternatives showed the two lanes.

Councilor Ralston said if it was timed right, they should not need the additional lane.

Mr. Viggiano described the variances in running time that could sometimes cause delays.

Discussion was held regarding the placement of the trees on the map.

Councilor Pishioneri asked about passenger boarding and de-boarding and where that would occur.

Mr. Viggiano said there would be specific stops for boarding. The stations would be about a one-third mile apart. The stops were noted on the map included in the agenda packet. The stops were located in areas that were safe to cross the street.

Mr. Viggiano said parts of Harlow Road with Alternative 1 had two lanes and parts had one lane. Options being considered included a planted median or an expanded right-of-way. Key issues on Harlow and Gateway were property issues and especially access issues. LTD was currently talking with businesses and residents in that area. A single lane would make it more difficult to provide left turn access. Double lanes provided more opportunities to make turns.

Councilor Woodrow asked if this area referred predominately from Harlow to Beltline or the entire length of Beltline.

Mr. Viggiano said it varied between single and double lanes in that area. There was intent, especially with Alternative 1, to look at the impact on adjacent property and to try to lessen that impact.

Councilor Woodrow said there was no left turn other than stop lights on the mall side of Gateway. On the other side there was an entrance to the apartments.

Mr. Viggiano said there were not many curb cuts on the south end of Gateway and there were only a few to the apartments. There were more accesses in the north area.

Councilor Pishioneri asked about the bus stops along Gateway and boarding issues.

Mr. Viggiano said the Gateway station would be on the Gateway property. He explained the other three stops and how people would board on median stations.

Councilor Ballew asked if the second alternative would take more right-of-way.

Mr. Viggiano said that was correct because Alternative 2 recommended two lanes. Both Gateway and Harlow Road were currently five lanes. He discussed the right-of-ways in that area. Some of

the trade-offs would include single lanes in some areas. In some cases, access could be so important that neither alternative would work. He discussed mixing and matching these alternatives in certain areas. He referenced a map of International Way and the businesses the EmX would serve. He said there was not a lot of traffic on International Way at this time, but there would be more traffic in the future. One suggestion from the committee was to buy the right-of-way now while able to for future use. Under Alternative 2, the curb line would stay where it was, and the extra lane in the middle would be taken up because the bike path would be moved to an off-street path. Mr. Viggiano said LTD had been working with PeaceHealth regarding property for the RiverBend bus route. PeaceHealth agreed to allocate land in the middle of RiverBend Drive for the EmX lanes. He said it was important to know if there were other alternatives they needed to consider.

Councilor Ballew asked about the time tables. LTD showed construction during 2009-2010, but the city would be constructing MLK Parkway sooner than that.

Mr. Viggiano said LTD was out of sync because of the federal requirements they must follow. The timeline was based on a realistic expectation and also assumed the funding would be secured. There were problems with MLK and RiverBend because they would be built prior to this project. It would make sense to build transit lanes at the same time. LTD would fund the portion on MLK separately from the rest of the project so the transit lanes were built at the same time the roadway was built. LTD did receive special approval from the federal government to proceed with MLK. They wanted to do the same with RiverBend Drive and were working with the federal government to move ahead on that roadway as well. If LTD was not able to get the federal funds, they could use local funds to build that section in order to save time.

Councilor Ballew said there was a lot of spirit of trust, building now, with assurance of reimbursement. She had concerns about that.

Mr. Viggiano said promissory notes would not work. LTD was committed to the City of Springfield to pay for the project at the time it was built. He assumed PeaceHealth would also require LTD pay as they build.

Councilor Woodrow asked about the length of EmX vehicles.

Mr. Viggiano said they were 60 feet and would be able to get around the roundabout. The 60 foot vehicles turn better than 40 foot vehicles.

Councilor Ralston said he would support using the least amount of space. Along the south end of Pioneer Parkway he would recommend using part of the railroad right-of-way as much as possible to get busses off the road so they do not mix with traffic. He said he didn't want the busses to impede traffic. On Harlow Road he would prefer the EmX Alternative 1. He said the middle raised median seemed like a waste of space. On Gateway Road, he would prefer EmX Alternative 1, placing the busses out of the lanes of traffic. On International Way, he preferred EmX Alternative 2. It used less right-of-way and put the bike paths away from traffic as much as possible.

Mayor Leiken said this would take busses off the regular route so they would not block traffic on other streets.

Mr. Viggiano said that was correct. He noted other streets that traffic does get blocked by the bus.

Mayor Leiken said he would appreciate updates from LTD when they put in the neighborhood routes.

Mr. Viggiano said LTD was looking at how to serve the neighborhoods.

Councilor Fitch said the technical committee continued to meet on those issues as well as the BRT Steering Committee. She said she appreciated Mr. Viggiano's input. The challenge was to provide transportation corridors for bikes as well as the EmX. It would be a challenge to meet all timelines.

Mayor Leiken encouraged LTD to continue dialogue with city staff.

Public Works Director Dan Brown said as point of fact, the railroad does not own right-of-way. The right-of-way along the Pioneer Parkways belonged either to the state or the city. The city acquired it from Southern Pacific Railroad for \$200,000.

Mr. Viggiano said there would be a public open house on April 14, 2005. Council was invited to attend.

2. Consideration of Issues Regarding Processing Development Applications in the Glenwood Riverfront Project Area.

City Planner Susanna Julber presented the staff report on this item. The package of amendments necessary to adopt a redevelopment plan for the Glenwood Riverfront, initiated by council on September 20, 2004, will be reviewed by the Lane County and Springfield Planning Commissions on April 19, 2005, and the Joint Elected Officials in June or July. In order to construct Glenwood Refinement Plan policies and accompanying Springfield Development Code (SDC) regulations, staff is seeking council direction on the preferred amount of flexibility built into the development review process.

Staff is currently developing a new Article in the SDC, the "Glenwood Riverfront (GR) Plan District." Council is requested to identify development flexibility parameters, and whether review approval should be vested with staff, the Planning Commission or the council. Decisions by council on this matter may have a corresponding influence on policy language contained in the refinement plan text amendments.

Consistent with staff's understanding of existing council objectives, development in compliance with the Riverfront Plan is subject to site plan review and other necessary land use applications without a Master Plan review. Proposals that vary somewhat from the Riverfront Plan use the Master Plan Modification process (a Type I or Type II staff review, depending on the extent of the proposal). Proposals that vary substantially from the Riverfront Plan use the Major Modification process (reviewed as a Type III by the Planning Commission or a Type IV by the City Council). A Modification process allows consideration of development proposals that vary from the mixed use, nodal development land use scenario anticipated in the Riverfront Plan (completed by Otto Poticha and Jerry Diethelm).

Direction on the following questions will form the basis for development policy and regulations that will be contained in the proposed Plan and Code amendments. An abbreviated outcomes highlight for these questions is presented in Attachment 1.

- Does the council prefer a flexible master plan modification process or development in accordance with the Riverfront Plan only?
- Two market studies completed for the Riverfront Plan recommended a residential component of 60% and retail and office at 40% or less. Should the council adopt specific land use allocations to ensure a mixed-use development pattern of 30-60% residential, 5-10% commercial, etc.? If a development does not comply with these land use allocations, and proposes to change them using a master plan modification, does the council prefer these requests to be Plan Amendments heard by council, or should they be a Type III process heard by the Planning Commission?
- Would the council prefer to review Major Modification proposals, refer them to the Planning Commission as Type III, or have staff review as a Type II?

Ms. Julber said that she was scheduled to attend the Springfield Economic Development Agency (SEDA) meeting on Monday, April 11. She distributed a map outlining the Glenwood Riverfront Plan area. This was the first attempt at nodal development in the Springfield area. A lot of public involvement had been part of the development process and the state funded multi-year planning grants to establish the plan. She discussed the development of Franklin Boulevard and the McVey Highway. She described the area included in this plan. Ms. Julber said this was not the only plan for this area and there could be modifications to this plan. Ms. Julber said she was looking to council to determine the amount of flexibility they wanted in the development review process. She was also looking to council to determine at what level plans would be reviewed by staff, Planning Commission and/or the City Council. She noted that council chose to review master plan modifications in the Gateway area of the PeaceHealth project, although normally master plans were reviewed by the Planning Commission. The goal of having a flexible review process would be to respond to development proposals that had not been anticipated.

Councilor Ralston asked where Roaring Rapids was on the map and if the Glenwood Riverfront Plan would affect their property.

Ms. Julber said it would only affect their property if they were going to redevelop their property.

Discussion was held regarding initials on the map – RT. Ms. Julber said RT stood for Residential Type.

Mr. Leahy said Mr. Roth, owner of Roaring Rapids, attended the Planning Commission meeting and endorsed this plan.

Ms. Julber said they had received acceptance of this plan by many of the property owners in this area.

Mayor Leiken referred to the Gateway Refinement Plan which was put into place in the late 1980's, and how it had remained flexible. He said it would be important to be flexible as this area would be a major redevelopment. He said developers would be creative and being flexible

would be key. As long as the city was flexible within reason, a quality opportunity could be built along the river. He noted the Portland riverfront as a good example.

Councilor Lundberg said she would recommend Option three.

Ms. Julber said she had noted that council wanted the flexible process. She asked if council would prefer reviewing the requests for modifications or send them to the Planning Commission.

Councilor Lundberg said council would see them anyway.

Councilor Ralston asked if the City Council would review them or the SEDA Board.

Mr. Tamulonis said SEDA would only be involved regarding infrastructure.

Ms. Julber asked if council wanted to hear the modifications. Yes.

Councilor Fitch asked about minor amendments or major amendments. She gave examples.

Councilor Lundberg said she would prefer the Planning Commission review minor changes, rather than staff and the City Council review major changes.

Ms. Julber said there could be modifications requests that were minor. The Development Services Director could bump those up to a Type III for additional review.

Councilor Fitch said it would be important to look at other developments. This plan would need to have a vision to it and a level of standard to warrant location on the waterfront. Standards should be such that it would encourage high quality employment or mixed use.

Ms. Julber said the code language was written identifying this area as a node, which would not allow auto oriented uses, such as drive-throughs and outdoor storage. There were also criteria the master plan modifications must meet, such as being pedestrian friendly and providing environmentally sound drainage systems. The guiding principals of the Riverfront Plan had to be met by the master plan modifications. She said there was a maximum footprint of 50,000 square feet in the mixed-use nodal development areas. They could build up.

Councilor Ballew said if they built up, it would block the view of the river.

Ms. Julber said those could be reviewed in the master plan modification process.

Discussion was held regarding viewing of the river and access to the river.

Councilor Lundberg said any improvement for accessibility to the river would be an improvement. She referred to the recent master plan process with PeaceHealth and how it was changed to make it better through the process. She said she had no fear that the riverfront would not look the way they wanted it to look.

Ms. Julber said staff recommended the master plan modification have a minimum development area of five acres. That amount was currently in the development code. It could be changed if there was a lot of interest in three acre sites.

Council approved the five acre minimum.

Ms. Julber said staff would like to adopt certain land use applications, such as certain percentages for residential, commercial and office. Those percentages could be changed through the modification process.

Councilor Lundberg asked if that wasn't guided by the nodal designation.

Ms. Julber said somewhat, although there was not a specific mix recommended.

Councilor Pishioneri asked if a change to those allocations would be a minor or major amendment.

Ms. Julber said it would be a major amendment.

Councilor Ralston discussed the percentage of change that would trigger the type of review.

Councilor Ballew said it may not add up to one hundred percent. Flexibility would be key and she would prefer more commercial than residential.

Ms. Julber said with mixed use districts there could be a lot of mixing of those uses.

Discussion was held regarding overlapping of different uses.

Mayor Leiken said Springfield was not the first community with a river running through it. He suggested looking at communities nationally and regionally to see what they have done. San Antonio, although a much larger city, had a beautiful riverfront.

Councilor Fitch said there could be property owners that were willing sellers to offer land to SEDA that could be used in watershed area. That property could then be purchased by other developers to make sure the master plan works. Piecing together several lots could be a challenge.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder